

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT TACOMA

11 ROBERT MITCHELL,  
12                   Plaintiff,  
13                  v.  
14 M. DRAGOON et al.,  
15                   Defendants.

CASE NO. C10-5436 RBL/JRC  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY

16  
17       This 42 U.S.C. §1983 civil rights matter has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate  
18 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and(B) and Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1,  
19 MJR 3, and MJR 4.

20       Before the court is plaintiff's motion to extend discovery (ECF No. 19). The motion was  
21 filed 27 days after the discovery deadline had past. Defendants oppose the motion because  
22 plaintiff did not seek any discovery during the months discovery was open (ECF No. 20 and 23).  
23 Further, the motion to extend the deadline is untimely. Plaintiff has not demonstrated his failure  
24 to move for an extension prior to the deadline was due to "excusable neglect" pursuant to Fed. R.  
25 Civ. P. 6 (b), which reads in relevant part as follows:

1                             (b) Extending Time.

2                             (1) In General. When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may,  
3                               for good cause, extend the time:

4                             (A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the  
5                               original time or its extension expires; or

6                             (B) on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of  
7                               excusable neglect.

8                             Pro se prisoners, like other civil litigants, are required to comply with both the federal  
9                               civil and local court rules of civil procedure, notwithstanding the court's obligation "to make  
10                              reasonable allowances for pro se litigants and to read pro se papers liberally." McCabe v. Arave,  
11                             827 F.2d 634, 640 n. 6 (9th Cir.1987). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that he is entitled to  
12                              relief from the discovery cutoff deadline,

13                             The motion is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to send a copy of this Order to  
14                              plaintiff and remove (ECF No. 19) from the calendar.

15                             DATED this 18<sup>th</sup> day of May 2011.

16  
17                             

18                             J. Richard Creatura  
19                               United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26